

COMMUNITY FRAMEWORK PLAN

Purpose of Community Framework Plan

The purpose of the Community Framework Plan (CFP) is to establish a consensus among the citizens of Clark County about which lands eventually will be committed to urban uses, and which should remain rural. The Plan provides policy direction for future urban and rural areas. The Plan will enable local governments to plan for future land uses and major capital facilities, not only for the 20-year horizon required in the Growth Management Act (GMA), but for the longer development of the County. It is an outline of the elements that should be included in the 20-year Comprehensive Growth Management Plans prepared by each city and Clark County under the GMA.

Prior to adoption of the CFP, three alternative means of accommodating growth in the County were developed based on the values expressed by County residents who participated in the Countywide visioning process. The CFP established the preferred development pattern to accommodate long-term growth. Four alternatives were considered for the CFP:

- **Country** – The Country concept would have maximized opportunities for rural lifestyles throughout the County, with dispersed large-lot residential, commercial, and industrial development.
- **Metropolitan** – The Metropolitan option would have concentrated growth in the southern part of the County, where it has been focused historically. A fairly even distribution of urban development would spread along the Columbia River and up Interstate 5 (I-5) toward Ridgefield.
- **Hometown** – The Hometown alternative would have concentrated growth in urban centers, with each center separate and distinct from the others and each containing different combinations of housing, shopping, and employment. Urban development would have an average density of approximately 12 units per net acre, and more housing would be multi-family. Outside of urban areas, the land would be predominantly farms, forests, and open space, with few residences and little shopping or business.
- **No Action Alternative: Adopted Comprehensive Plans** – If the County were to take no action, the existing comprehensive plans would remain in effect.

The Hometown alternative was selected as the preferred alternative based on the results from surveys of residents at a series of public meetings. The CFP was developed from the Hometown concept, with modifications to reflect the comments and concerns of the public and elected officials and adopted by the Board of County Commissioners on May 26, 1993.

KEY ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

UGA Movement - 75% and 50% Rules

The County adopted the Plan Amendment Ordinance (Clark County Code CCC 18.610). Subsection 18.610.110 requires that a least 75% of the available Residential and commercial and 50% of the industrial land supply within the UGAs must be developed before a proposal to expand a boundary can be considered.

The 75 and 50% threshold consumption rate of originally designated buildable land base is significant because it came about as a result of remand from the Hearings Board on issues relating to the Urban Growth Areas boundary expansion.

The current absorption of gross vacant residential land as presented in the Plan Monitoring Report is shown below. Tables 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 will be updated in April of 2000 with 1999 data.

**Table 1.5.1 Development of vacant and underutilized residential land
(Gross Acreage) 1994-98**

Urban Growth Area Including City Limits	Vacant and underutilized residential land 1994-95	Vacant and underutilized residential land 1998	Calculated Residential Development	Percentage of vacant and underutilized land developed from 1994 – 1998	Average Annual absorption rate
Battleground	1822ac	1221ac	601ac	33%	11%
Camas	2313ac*	965ac	1348ac	58%	19.4%
La Center	757ac	358ac	399ac	53%	17.6%
Ridgefield	1130ac	1050ac	80ac	7%	2.4%
Vancouver	8850ac	6185ac	2665ac	30%	10.0%
Washougal	1425ac	835ac	590ac	41%	13.8%
Yacolt	104ac	84ac	20ac	16%	6.4%
Totals	16,401ac	10,698ac	5,703ac	35%	11.6%

Source: Clark County Department of Assessment and GIS

* This includes about 600 acres (an area known as the Camas Meadows) which was zoned single family residential in 1995. In 1996, the area was annexed within the city limits of Camas and designated as industrial.

Commercial and Industrial Land Absorption

Background and Relevance

The county's Comprehensive Plan designates areas of buildable commercial lands in amounts needed to meet 20-year employment targets. Measuring how quickly these land supplies are developed is an important indicator of economic conditions at the local level. The County Procedures Ordinance requires that at least 75% of the available commercial land and 50% of the industrial land supply within the UGAs be developed before proposals to expand UGA boundaries can be considered.

Table 1.5.2 Gross vacant and underutilized commercial and industrial land, 1994-98

Urban Growth Area	Vacant and underutilized land in Acres 1994**		Vacant and underutilized land in Acres 1998		Change 95 to 98		Percentage of vacant and underutilized land developed, 1995-1998		Annualized absorption rate (change/3 years)	
	Com.	Ind.	Com.	Ind.	Com.	Ind.	Com.*	Ind.	Com.	Ind.
Battleground	81	329	176	188	*	141		43%		14.3%
Camas	35	1058	66	992	*	66		6.2%		2.0%
La Center	8	352***	37	0	*	352***				
Ridgefield	77	781	308	565	*	216		28%		9.3%
Vancouver	2329	5562	1877	3883	452	1679	19%	30%	6.3%	10.0%
Washougal	89	349	48	236	41	113	46%	32%	15.3%	10.7%
Yacolt	23	10	18	10	5	0	22%	0%	7.3%	0%

Source: Clark County Department of Assessment and GIS

*In September of 1998 the vacant lands analysis was based on the most current comp plan. Comparisons to the original plan adopted in 1995, were difficult due to Comp. Plan amendments and related changes undertaken automatically by cities; and due to adjustments in the commercial vacant lands GIS methodology.

** From the 1994 Clark County 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Vacant Land Analysis.

***The data for La Center are from the 1994 planning area, which includes urban reserve area.

Gross Land: Residential, Commercial and Industrial

The following two tables are provided as a summary of the gross vacant residential, commercial, and industrial lands.

Table 1.5.5 Gross Land Availability Summary Table by UGA, 1998

	Residential Acres	Commercial Acres	Industrial Acres
Battle Ground	1,221	176	188
Camas	965	66	992
La Center	358	37	0
Ridgefield	1,050	308	565
Vancouver	6,185	1,877	3,883
Washougal	835	48	236
Yacolt	84	18	10
Sum	10,698	2,530	5,874

Table 1.5.6 Gross Land Availability Summary Table by UGA, 1994

	Residential Acres	Commercial Acres	Industrial Acres
Battle Ground	1,822	81	329
Camas	2,313	35	1,058
La Center	757	8	352
Ridgefield	1,130	77	781
Vancouver	8,850	2,329	5,562
Washougal	1,425	89	349
Yacolt	104	23	10
Sum	16,401	2,642	8,441

Source: 1994 Clark County 20 year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Vacant Lands Analysis

The 5-Year Rule

Another related issue is the adoption of the 5-year rule. The Hearings Board Remand adds a limitation to review the county plan to a minimum of once every 5 years. In Chapter 12 of the Clark County 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan under Amendments to 20-Year Plan and particularly on Urban Growth Boundary Changes, it states that:

“A comprehensive review will be initiated and considered by the county and applicable city a maximum of once every five years”.

On issues relating to boundary changes the Plan states that:

“Boundary amendments may be approved only when it is shown by the proponent (county or city) that the supply of available land is insufficient to accommodate anticipated growth”.

The Plan also lists criteria that should be used to determine where and how much land should be added to the urban area. One of the criteria is that:

“The amendment shall address the assumptions, trends, key indicators and performance measures established in the *Land Use Element, Chapter 2*”.

This criteria is in reference to the urban growth area indicators in Chapter 2 of the Plan which is intended to:

“provide an "early warning" system to ensure that the land supply is not being over constrained or that development is occurring in a manner inconsistent with the intent of the urban growth area;

verify and adjust if required the assumptions used to calculate the baseline supply and demand for vacant land; and,

provide decision makers with objective data that can be used to evaluate the performance of the comprehensive growth management plans in achieving the goals and policies that the plan was intended to promote (e.g., increasing density, promoting transit and pedestrian friendly designs)”.

The Plan Monitoring Report released in November is the first plan monitoring report produced by Clark County. It covered more than twenty indicators.

Population Distribution, Housing and Density Targets

Urban/Rural Population Split (81/19)

Table 1.1.6 Population by Rural and Urban Growth Area

Year	Urban	% Urban	Rural	% Rural	Total
1990	197,457	83%	40,525	17%	237,982
1995	239,368	82%	51,632	18%	291,000
1998	271,388	83%	56,612	17%	328,000
% chng 90-98	37%		40%		38%
Avg. Annual Growth	4.7%		5.0%		4.7%

Table 1.1.7 Share of Growth, Urban and Rural

Year	Urban Growth	% Urban	Rural Growth	% Rural	Total Growth	Average Growth
1990-95	41,911	79.1%	11,107	20.9%	53,018	10,604
1995-98	32,020	86.5%	4,980	13.5%	37,000	12,333
1990-98	73,931	82.1%	16,087	17.9%	90,018	11,252

New Housing Single-Family/Multi-Family Split – 60/40

There was a remand on this issue. The Hearings Board found that particularly smaller cities had inadequate provisions in their development regulations to meet the 60/40 single-family to multi-family ratio. As a result, the county and smaller cities adopted new measures to achieve these opportunities.

Policy 5.7.1 was amended in 1996 with the addition of the following strategies:

Policy 5.7.1 reads:

“Provide opportunities for new development to occur in a housing type ratio of 60 percent single family and 40 percent multi-family. Strategies to achieve these opportunity include but are not limited to:

- a. Minimum density for single family.
- b. Minimum density for multi-family.
- c. Provisions for Accessory Dwelling Units.
- d. Provision for duplexes in single family.
- e. Provisions for townhouses/ rowhouses.
- f. Allowance for manufactured home parks.
- g. Provision for diversified housing types allowed as part of a Planned Unit Development.
- h. Recognition of the flexibility allowed in housing types as part of a Mixed Use Development (i.e., living units above commercial areas).
- i. Recognition of Assisted Living Units as a housing type”.

If the cities and county are not achieving that goal, actions need to be taken to resolve the issue. Table 1.6.1 of the Plan Monitoring Report present information on single-family and multi-family units built from 1995 to 1998. This table will be updated with 1999 figures.

Table 1.6.1 Single-Family and Multi-Family Units Built (1995-1999)

		1995	1995%	1996	1996%	1997	1997%	1998	1998%	95 to 98	95 to 98 %
Battle Ground											
	SF	175	85%	338	99%	345	80%	128	98%	986	89%
	MF	30	15%	4	1%	88	20%	2	2%	124	11%
	Total	205	100%	342	100%	433	100%	130	100%	1,110	100%
Camas											
	SF	271	100%	305	100%	345	0%	146	0%	1,067	100%
	MF	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	271	100%	305	100%	345	0%	146	0%	1,067	100%
La Center											
	SF	71	96%	60	95%	87	78%	24	63%	242	85%
	MF	3	4%	3	5%	24	22%	14	37%	44	15%
	Total	74	100%	63	100%	111	100%	38	100%	286	100%
Ridgefield											
	SF	31	100%	26	100%	31	100%	12	100%	100	100%
	MF	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	31	100%	26	100%	31	100%	12	100%	100	100%
Vancouver											
	SF	2,067	71%	2,195	70%	2,167	63%	1,432	53%	7,861	64%
	MF	843	29%	953	30%	1,260	37%	1,279	47%	4,335	36%
	Total	2,910	100%	3,148	100%	3,427	100%	2,711	100%	12,196	100%
Washougal											
	SF	69	100%	100	100%	68	100%	49	100%	286	100%
	MF	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	69	100%	100	100%	68	100%	49	100%	286	100%
Yacolt											
	SF	9	100%	11	85%	10	100%	17	100%	47	96%
	MF	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%
	Total	9	100%	13	100%	10	100%	17	100%	49	100%
Rural											
	SF	577	100%	565	100%	522	98%	435	100%	2,099	100%
	MF	0	0%	0	0%	8	2%	0	0%	8	0%
	Total	577	100%	565	100%	530	100%	435	100%	2,107	100%
Sum											
	SF	3,270	79%	3,600	79%	3,575	72%	2,243	63%	12,688	74%
	MF	876	21%	962	21%	1,380	28%	1,295	37%	4,513	26%
	Total	4,146	100%	4,562	100%	4,955	100%	3,538	100%	17,201	100%

Source: Clark County Department of GIS

The adopted Comprehensive Plan assumptions for urban and rural population split are 19.1% for unincorporated rural area and 80.7% for the Urban Growth Area. The following tables show the UGA and rural population estimates for 1990, 1995, and 1998. These tables will be updated with 1999 data.

Table 1.6.2 Urban and Rural – Single-Family Multi-Family Split 1995-1998

	January 1, 1995	Percent of Total	Growth 1995 to 1998	Percent of Total	Growth Rate	December 31, 1998	Percent of Total
Single Family	81,520		12,689		15.6%	94,209	
Urban	64,413	79.0%	10,591	83.5%	16.4%	75,004	79.6%
Rural	17,107	21.0%	2,098	16.5%	12.3%	19,205	20.4%
Multi-Family	25,921		4,510		17.4%	30,431	
Urban	25,856	99.7%	4,502	99.8%	17.4%	30,358	99.8%
Rural	65	0.3%	8	0.2%	12.3%	73	0.2%
Total Housing	107,441		17,199		16.0%	124,640	
Urban	90,269	84.0%	15,093	87.8%	16.7%	105,362	84.5%
Rural	17,172	16.0%	2,106	12.2%	12.3%	19,278	15.5%
Population	286,983		46,144		16.1%	333,127	
Urban	236,154	82.3%	39,910	86.5%	16.9%	276,064	82.9%
Rural	50,829	17.7%	6,234	13.5%	12.3%	57,063	17.1%

Source: Clark County Department of Assessment and GIS

Density Targets

One other topic is density. The county's Comprehensive Plan assumed an average of 6 units per acre for new single-family development and 16 units for multi-family. The targeted single-family and multi-family residential assumption of 6 and 16 units per acre is for the 2012 planning period. These densities are calculated at the parcel level and so represent *net* residential densities.

Single-Family Density

Current information was collected from the Clark County Assessment database. Information was collected for new single-family developments based on property type codes and building permit year. The total number of single-family lots were counted along with the acreage for all development. The number of new units was divided by the total acres to derive an average residential density for single-family development. The information was limited to development inside Urban Growth Areas.

The following formula was used to determine average density:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Units} / \text{Acres} &= \text{Density} \\ 10,926 / 2,694.90 &= 4.1\end{aligned}$$

Multi-Family Density

Current information was collected from the Clark County Assessment database. Property type codes and building permit information was used to determine new multi-family development from 1995 to present. Development outside urban growth areas was excluded. Mobile home parks, mobile home condominiums, and single-family type condominium developments were excluded from the analysis. The number of new units was divided by the total acres to derive an average residential density for multi-family development.

The following formula was used to determine average density:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Units} / \text{Acres} &= \text{Density} \\ 4,948 / 304.60 &= 16.2\end{aligned}$$

Source: Clark County Assessment Database, September 1999.